(Preserve)

App.F.IX-4]

1924. 5

File No. S+A 27-24.

(S+A.)

Previous References.

Jamapanna Naik & Katappa Naik of the Chitaloog Pollegar family File No. 7.
Gudikota Pollegar family File No 37
S/A 285-10-6-9+11.

Serial Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, + 13.

Later references.

S+A. 361-36 (1-2)
S/A 35-25-1 to 6.
S/A 36-25-7+8.
" 115-/28-do
- on 94-24-8

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

S/A. 498-30 (1-4)
" 177-31-(3-5)
S.P 4-46-1, 2, 3.

Serial Nos. 10

Part B for August 1925.

SUBJECT

Forwards his report on the petition of Annammiamma wife of R. P. Venkatapathi Naik of Royadrug Pollegar Family, praying for the grant of maintenance allowance.

Secs. 13 To The Comptroller to Govt.

No. FL 1328 dated 29th August 192

Directs that out of the pension intended for the benefit of the family, of the family pension of Rs 87. 8. 9 a sum of Rs. 29/- will be treated as the share of Mr R Venkatapathi Naik and out of this share Rs 15/- will be paid to the Petitioner (Annamma

AL 15/X

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SJA File No. 27 of 1924

Serial No. 2

From Comptroller, No. 4324/A 28.11.25. Forwards this report on the petition of Annamanamma wife of R. P. Venkatapathi naik of Royadrug Family praying for the grant of maintenance allowance.

1) The Comptroller has not forwarded the records of enquiry made by the State Huzur Treasury Officer taken the depositions & statements made by the petitioners husband etc.

2) The Genealogical table of the family & also the First Munsiff's Judgment in the case brought by petitioners husband against his wife, seems necessary for reference before the question of granting maintenance allowance to the petitioner is considered.

3) ~~the Comptroller be asked to~~ Draft asking the Comptr to forward the above papers to be laid for attention & other orders.

12/2

13/12/25

SJA

2)

To Comptroller; No. M 4643 of 16/12/24 Serial No.

Requesting him to forward the records of enquiry regarding the claim of Ramaswamy together with the [illegible] of the District Munsif [illegible].

Petition of 8.2.25 from Ramaswamy praying for the grant of a maintenance allowance of Rs. 25/- for the support of himself & his daughter.

(2) [illegible] No. 4892 of 20/2/25 [illegible] the records [illegible] Ramaswamy [illegible] Rs. 25/- per mensem.

It will be seen from the judgment of the First Munsiff, that the husband of the petitioner — Venkatapathi Naik had ill treated his wife & is of intemperate habits & it is not safe to allow the petitioner to live with him and the suit for restitution of conjugal rights has been dismissed with costs.

The father-in-law of the petitioner — Mr. Kaneti Naik is the Baramahal drawing a pension of Rs. 87-8-9 p.m. He has two sons by 1st wife & 2 daughters by 2nd wife.

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

APP. F. III—2]

3107

General and Revenue Secretariat. | SHA File No. 27 of 1924. 3)

Serial No.

6) The petitioner - Annamamma is the wife of the second son - Venkatapathi Naik and she has a daughter & prays that she may be allowed an allowance of Rs 25/- p.m. for maintenance out of the family pension of Rs 87-8-9.

7) The Comptroller states that it is not clear whether during the life time of the registered Varawardar - Koneti Naik, his son - Venkatapathi Naik can insist on his father to share the pension with him & in the absence of such a right it is doubtful whether any portion of the pension may be ordered to be paid to the petitioner. But he is of opinion that a sum of Rs 5/- may be ordered to be paid, out of the allowance of Rs 15/- p.m. allowed to his Son - Venkatapathi Naik by his father, for the maintenance of the petitioner & her daughter.

8) Reference is invited to Sir. K. Seshadri Iyer's minute of 21.7.86 & 5.XI.1886 regarding the division of Palleyar Pensions according to Hindu Law & also G.O. nos C. 1018 of 5.XI.86 & No 4742/252 of 11.XI.86 re-maintenance allowance to widows & other female members.

Submitted for orders.

Vide 19/3. The references given above have no bearing on this particular Case. As the whole pension &

822.

K

V

Contn. Sheet .

Serial No.

The family rg Rs 87-8-9 is registered in the name of Kanchi Naick, the father in law of the petitioner, Annamma Amma, it seems necessary that an enquiry should be made of him as to how he proposes to support his daughter-in-law & grandchildren and what the claim for maintenance may the Comptr be asked to summon him & make enquiries on this point?

Agreed

25/3/25

Is the payment of Rs 15 to Venkatapathi Naick according to any order of Court? If not the question is what maintenance allowance should be given to the wife out of the family pension drawn by his father and out of what is allowed to him. The Comptr may be asked, as proposed by the Asst Secy to ascertain what Kanchi Naick the head of the family and the Banavardar has to say. It is necessary to know if his daughters are married or unmarried and what family obligations the Banavardar has to meet from his pension but before further action is taken please let the Asst Secy know if Rs 15 to Venkatapathi Naick is under any order of Court or arrangement known or reported to them

27.2.25

Serial No.

11) The allowance of Rs 15/- to Venkatapathie Naik by his father - Koneti Naik is not authorized by Govt, but it is purely a private arrangement
Please see Comptroller's letter of 28.1.25 paras 2 & 3.

12) Submitted with reference to para 10.
3/3 Secy

13) Please put up draft to Comptr for information referred to in Note 27.2.25
4/4/25

14) Draft submitted for approval.
5/4

15) Issue
6/4/25

7. To Comptroller, No Fl 5801 dt 9.4.25
Request him to summon the bramavaru Sri. Koneti naik and to enquire how he proposes to meet the claim of the petitioner for her maintenance & also to state whether his daughters are all married & what family obligations he has to meet from the income

(P.T.O.

SJA File No. 2) Ours 6) of 1924 General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial No.

8) From (Inspector, No 705) dt 21.4.25. Forwards the Statement of Mr. Kondi naik & states that Mr. Kondi naik has no objection to his son — Venkatapathi naik paying any amount to his wife Ramanamma annually (petitioner) out of the sum of Rs 167 — allowed to him. As Mr. Kondi naik & the bridegroom could not afford to pay anything more either to his son or his daughter in-law

10) Petition dt 25.4.25 from Mrs: Ramanamma dt Dowards in continuation of her previous petition dt 5.2.25 certain facts regarding the pecuniary position of her father-in-law, Kondi naik & prays that suitable allowance may be ordered for the maintenance of herself & her daughter in view of the above consideration etc

Petn filed received

16) Submitted for orders with reference to Mr. Henry's note of 4.4.25.

17) L.C. Secretary has to be consulted.

18) The petitioner may be informed to Complete for

Page 5

General and Revenue Secretariat. SRA File No. 27 (1645 9 7) of 1924.

Serial No.

for enquiry & reports as ordered by the H Secy on the petition received on 25.4.25. This may be done now. Draft please

mad 21/5/25

19) Draft submitted for approval.

mad 21/5/25

Mulsw 21/5

11 To Campbeller, No H 6316 dt 23.5.25 forwards the petition of Annamiamma for further enquiry & report

hm

12 From Campbeller, No S 309 dt 18.6.25 forwards the report of enquiry made on the petitions of Annamiammal.

20) Submitted for orders with reference to H Secy's note dt 4.4.25. — Page 5.

21) Perhaps this may be referred to Law Deptt. for remarks as to what share the petitioner — Annamiammal is entitled under Hindu Law on the face of the first Munsiff's Judgment dt 30.8.21 & Campbell's letter dt 28.1.25

Submitted for orders

J P

Mr 2/7

Secy 2/7

H Secy

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

Serial No.

22) It is, I think, not necessary to investigate what properties or other sources of income than the Government Pension the petitioner's husband or his father the barawardar of the pension have. The only question for consideration by Government is what allowance for maintenance, if any, should be paid to the petitioner in the circumstances represented by her. From what is stated in the judgment of the Munsiff, it would appear that the separation of the petitioner from her husband is permanent and as the pension is intended for the benefit of the whole family, some provision out of it for the maintenance of the petitioner has to be allowed. Koneti Naik, the barawardar has two sons by his first deceased wife and two daughters by his secord wife, of whom one is married and the other ~~is~~ unmarried. There are, at present, therefore, three male members of the family, the barawardar and his two sons. The pension now drawn is Rs 87-8-9 and if each of the three male members is considered as entitled to an equal part, the share ~~is~~ of Venkatapathi Naik, the petitioner's husband will be about Rs 29 per month. It is stated that his father is allowing him a sum of Rs 15 per month and ~~the latter~~ Koneti Naik states that if any maintenance allowance should be given to the petitioner at all, it should come out of the sum of Rs 15 he is paying to his son. This does

Serial No

does not appear to be a reasonable contention, It is fair that his second son, the petitioner's husband should get about one-third of the pension for the maintenance of his family which now consists of two branches, the first being his first wife who has separated from him and her daughter and the second, himself and his second wife. If Rs 29/- is considered as his portion of the pension, some reasonable share out of it should be allowed to his first wife and her daughter. Considering all thin it seems to me that a monthly payment of Rs 12/- to the petitioner for the support of herself and he daughter is a reasonable maintenance allowance. This amount, the barawardar may be required to pay to her out of the total pension of Rs 87-8-9, in addition to the sum of Rs 15/- which he is paying to his second son, the petitioner's husband.

23) I do not know how the representation of the petitioner for a maintenance allowance should be viewed according to law, and whether the lay view of the matter expressed by me above is acceptable from the legal point of view as well. The case is, accordingly, forwarded with compliments to the Secretary, Local & Legislative Departments for favour of opinion.

9.7.25

24) Sd/ with a note

(L.L. secy)

G.R.S. III-23

WD 2119—GPB—10.000—27-4-25

General and Revenue Secretariat.

S+A File No. 27 of 1924

16

Serial No.

2) In fixing the amount of maintenance, regard must be had to the following:-

1. The income of the joint property or the property of the husband;
2. The position & status of the family;
3. The reasonable wants of the person to whom the maintenance is due. [Mulla on Hindu Code, p. 436]

In the present case, it is the duty of the husband to maintain his wife & his unmarried daughter. He is entitled to get Rs 29 p.m. as his pension. Besides he is capable of earning an additional income. He belongs to a Poligar family whose members to all intents & purposes are respectable & live in a comfortable style.

The cost of living has increased & it requires at least 10 & 15 Rs for a person to maintain herself. There is the unmarried daughter to be maintained. It may cost at least Rs 5 [illegible] m.

Having regard to these circumstances, a sum of Rs 16 p.m. at least may be allowed to the wife & her daughter. This, I think, will be the least sum which a Court of Law will allow.

DEWAN'S OFFICE, RECD. ON 13 AUG. 1925 Reg. No. 1046

DEWAN'S OFFICE, RECD. ON 13 AUG. 1925 Reg. No. 1385

Put up with Comp[t] 15/7/25

24.7. car

26) Of the total pension of Rs 87-8-9 I stated in my note of 9.7.25 that the Board could give Rs 17 to the Petitioner's husband and Rs 12 to the Petitioner for the maintenance of herself & her unmarried daughter - The legal opinion is that these amts should be reversed & Rs 14 and Rs 15.

Dewan pro Chief Secy 27) It is correct

Mag 22.7.25

Mg 31.7.25

29) Lpll W/11/8

28) Yes. Mr. Nagappa states that the petitioners husband is entitled to Rs 29 of which he should give Rs 15 to his wife and daughter and the balance left for him is Rs 14.

Please put up draft order 4/8/25

VOTE—Contn. Sheet

Mag 13.8.25

General and Revenue Secretariat.

SFA File No. 27 of 1924

Serial No	
31)	Draft submitted for approval with reference to para. 30 ~~above~~. (Mudaliar 24/8 Secy) 23/8/25 Secy 28/8/25
13	To Comptroller, Hyd no 1328 f 29.8.25. Sanctions a maintenance allowance of Rs. 15/- p.m. to Annamiamma wife of the family pensioner of Rs 87.8.9 drawn by Mr. Kneti Naik

B 14/10/25

NOTE—Contn. Sheet

D.2782

444.27-24 Fl

32511

Please address all future communications to the Comptroller to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.
In reply to this Comm. please refer to
No. 4324/SH Try.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, the 28th January 1925.

FROM

T. SATYARAJ CHETTY, ESQ., B.A.,
Comptroller to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

Rajakaryaprasaktha
M. N. Krishna Rao Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore.

Financial *Department.*

SIR,

I have the honour to state that Ammaniamma, wife of R. P. Venkatapathi Naik, son of Pollegar Pensioner, R.P. Koneti Naik of Royadurga Family, has applied for a grant for maintenance out of the share of the Pollegar Pension that her husband is being paid by his father.

2) Under Government Order No.18-19/P&A Fl.93-4 dated 13th and 14th September 1897, Koneti Naik was registered as Barawardar of a Pollegar Pension of Rs 87-8-9 per mensem. Owing to differences betwee himself and his son Venkatapathi Naik, Koneti Naik has been giving a sum of Rs 15/- per mensem to his son, who has been living separately. Venkatapathi Naik and his wife, the petitioner lived on good terms for some time, but later, differences arose between them with the result that the First Munsiff of Bangalore, dismissed suit O.S.No.381 of 1918-19 brought by Plaintiff Venkatapathi Naik against Ammaniamma and two other defendants for restitution of conjugal rights. The Munsiff held that Venkatapathi Naik ill-treated his wife, beat and

kicked and branded her, and it was therefore unsafe that the wife should live with her husband. Venkatapathi Naik has since taken a second wife and Ammaniamma and her daughter are living under the protection of Ammanniamma's father Gopalakrishnaswami Naik.

It is not clear whether during the lifetime of Koneti Naik, his son Venkatapathi Naik, can insist on his father sharing pension with him. In the absence of such a right in the son, it is doubtful whether any portion of the pension may be ordered to be paid to the petitioner for maintenance. In the present case, however, as Venkatapathi Naik is being allowed Rs 15/- per mensem by his father out of a pension of Rs 87-8-9, a sum of Rs 5/- out of the sum of Rs 15/- may be ordered to be paid towards maintenance to Ammanniamma and her unmarried daughter.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T. Satyaraj Chetty
Comptroller.

0102 GPB—3,000—27-8-21

C. O 45-Rec. —]

.....Department

192 .

FROM

T. SATYARAJ CHETTY, ESQ., B.A.,
Comptroller to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

.....Esq.,
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore, Dept.

Dated

Despatched

Received.

No.....

Subject matter.

2818

1924 - 1925

Dist. Vol a

Pet. No. 27-24

Serial No. 3

T O

RAJAKARYAPRASAKTA

M. N. KRISHNA RAO, Esqr., B.A.,

FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT

OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

B A N G A L O R E.

(Mr 9.2.25)

S i r,

In approaching you with this petition, I the undersigned, Ammaniamma, most respectfully beg leave to state as follows:--

2. That I remain attached to the Rayadrug Polegar Family, happening to be the wife of Venkatapathy Naik, son of Koneti Naik, a political pensioner in receipt of a monthly stipend of Rs.87-8-9 from the Mysore Government.

3. That about two years ago a legal divorce was effected between myself and my husband owing to his misconduct and ill-treatment I received at his hands.

4. That I have subsequently instituted a claim in my Petitions dated 28th February and 28th July 1924 addressed to the Huzur Treasury Officer for a reasonable share, in the above family pension, amounting to Rs.25/- per mensem on account of my maintenance and also that of my daughter; and understand from him that the matter has been submitted to Government for orders.

5. That pending same, I have, though rather prematurely, ventured to stay in Bangalore and the pecuniary help needed for meeting the necessaries of daily life of two Zenana ladies during these hard days is quite necessary and I am sure you are not unaware of these.

2782

6. That the sum of Rs.15/- referred to by my husband in his statement made before the Civil Court only represents pocket-money allowed to him every month by his father, Koneti Naik, so that the stipend of Rs.87-8-9 becomes available for the maintenance of the whole family, of which, as a legal member, I look to for protection during my life time and also that of my daughter till her marriage. Thus it will be -- observed the rest of my father-in-law Koneti Naik's family at present consists of himself and a little daughter - both living with his eldest son Rajagopal Naik. (Vide our geneological tree, copy of which is submitted herewith for immediate reference).

7. That, in conclusion, might I solicit the favour of your submitting my hard case to Government with your warm support and recommendation for such reasonable relief considered that it is deserving of, under all the foregoing circumstances?

For which act of kindness I shall feel ever grateful and thanking you in anticipation,

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

అమ్మణిమ్మ నరజుమ్మ

Dated,
8th February 1925.

(Sd.) AMMANIAMMA,

Address:-

Ammaniamma,
C/o M. Gopalakrishnaswamy Naik,
Palegar, No.147, Cottonpet,
Bangalore City.

* * *

Konafi Naik (Baravardhar)

Amount of monthly stipend now drawn Rs. 57-8-9.

1st wife (died)

(2 sons)

(1st son)

Rajagopal Naik and family

2nd wife (died).

(2 daughters).

1st daughter (married)

2nd daughter (unmarried)

(2nd son)

Venkatapathy Naik

(1st wife)

married on 11th June 1914

by name

Annamayamma, (petitioner)

(daughter by name

Narayanamma,)

(2nd wife)

married on

27th February 1921

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 282

General and Revenue Secretariat

(SM)

, *the* 191 .

Date of issue 14. 2. 25

Signed by M. A. Rangaswami

Section SM.

File No. 27/24

Serial No. 4

No. Ft 4243

To

The Comptroller

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 4324/S.K.T. of 28-1-25 regarding the claim of Annamma of the Rayaru Pallayar Family for a maintenance allowance, I am directed to request you to kindly forward the records of enquiry made by

over.

the

S. H. Dry officer together with the statements made by the petitioner's husband & others taken the copy of District Munsiff's Judgment referred to in your letter.

A copy of latest Genealogical Table of the family showing the ~~[illegible]~~ different members with their stipends etc of the family may also be forwarded to us without delay.

Yours faithfully,

[illegible]

13/2/25

For Secretary

[illegible]

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

35762

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

In reply please refer to No. 4872/S.H.T.

FINANCIAL SECRETARIATE 24 FEB. 1925

Comptroller's Office, Bangalore,

Dated the 20th February 1925

Enc. 5

GENL. & REV. SECTION 23 FEB. 1925 G. D SECTION

DIARY NO. 3104

1924 - 25

27-24

Rajakaryaprasaktha
M. N. Krishna Rao Esq., B.A.,
Financial Secretary to the
Government of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your No. Fl.4643S.A.27-24-4 dated 14th February 1925, I have the honor to submit herewith the marginally noted records of enquiry regarding the claim of Ammanniamma of the Rayadurga Pollegar Family for a maintenance allowance.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller.

1. Ammanniamma's original application together with a copy of the First Munsiff's Judgment in original Suit No.381 of 1918-19 on the File of his Court.

2. The Opponent Mr. R. P. Venkatapathy Naik's reply statement.

3. Ammaniamma's reply statement to the allegations contained in Mr. R. P. Venkatapathy Naik's statement.

4. A copy of the Geneological tree of the Rayadurga Family.

Konaki Naik, Revenue Peshgar, (Revenue Inspector) is getting a monthly stipend of Rs. 87-8-9.

1st Wife (dies).
(2 Sons).

2nd Wife (dies).
(2 Daughters).

1st Daughter
(Married)

2nd Daughter
(Unmarried).

(1st Son).
Rajagopal Naik,
(Married).

(2nd Son)
Venkatachelly Naik
(Absconded)

1st Wife Married on
11th June 1914.
by Name
Annamayamma (Rakhi Name)

(2nd Wife)
Married on 27th February 1921.

Daughter by Name
Narayanamma

App.F.VI-G1.]

SUBJECT

Section SHA
File No. 27/24
Serial No. 7.
No. 45600/ Genl

Diary No. of letter replied to 3104

General and Revenue Secretariat
(SHA)
, the 192

To The Comptroller

Date of issue 9.6.25

Signed by M. A. Rajadurai

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 4324/SHT of 28.1.25 regarding orders of Govt as per para 5 The maintenance allowance claimed by Annamma Amma of the Rayadurai Pallegar Family, I am directed to request you to summon the Head member of the family Mr. Kanchi naik & to ~~take evidence~~ enquire ~~and report as to~~ how he proposes to meet the claim of the petitioner for the maintenance of herself and her daughter. ~~X also to note as to~~ The manner of the enquiry may be supported if necessary to ascertain whether the karavandars daughters are married & what family obligations he has to meet from

over

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

this

his pension.

2) The enclosures to your letter are returned herewith.

Thanking,

Yours faithfully,

for Civil Secretary

43115

Please address all future communications to the Comptroller to the Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.
In reply to this Comn. please refer to
No. 7057 S.H.Try/Exc: one

23. APR. 1925

FIN.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Dated, Bangalore, the 21st April 1925.

GEN. & REGTT. BR. 22. APR. 1925 G. D. SECTION.

FROM

T. SATYARAJ CHETTY, ESQ., B.A.,
Comptroller to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

DIARY NO. 3895
1924 - 25
S+A
27-24
8

To

Rajakaryaprasaktha
M. N. Krishna Rao Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore.
Financial *Department.*

SIR,

With reference to your No.Fl.5601/S&A 27-24-7 dated the 9th instant, I have the honour to state that Mr. Koneti Naik of the Royadurga Pollegar Family appeared before the State Huzur Treasury Officer on the 18th instant and represented that he had no objection to his son Mr. Venkatapathi Naik paying any amount to his wife Ammanni amma as maintenance out of the sum of Rs 15/- allowed to him every mon and that he(Mr.Koneti Naik) could not afford to pay, out of his pension, anything more either to his son or his daughter-in-law.

The statement filed by Mr. Koneti Naik in the matter is herewith forwarded.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

T. Satyaraj Chetty

Comptroller.

0102 GPB—3,000—27-8-21

C. O 45-Rec. —]

.....Department

192 .

FROM

T. SATYARAJ CHETTY, ESQ., B.A.,

Comptroller to the Govt. of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

....ESQ.,

Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Dept.

Dated

Despatched

Received

No.....

Subject matter.

DIARY NO. 4045

1924 — 1926

Section. STA

File No. 27-24

10

To

Rajakaryaprasakta

M. N. Krishna Rao Esquire, B. A.,

Financial Secretary to the

Government of His Highness

The Maharaja of Mysore,

BANGALORE.

Sir,

In submitting the following few lines, with reference to certain important points ommitted by a mistake, for which I crave pardon, and believed to have direct bearing on my petition dated 8th February last, I most respectfully beg to state as under in continuation thereof.

2. That the pecuniary position of my father-in-law, Konati Naik, is not confined to the monthly stipend of Rs. 87-8-9 being, as he is in possession of certain other family assets comprising both movable and immovable properties valued at Rs.(Thirtyfour Thousand) 34,000/- as can be obseved from his statement made in the year 1916 before the District Judge of Madura, an extract from which is submitted herewith for information.

3. That the above aggregate sum, it will be observed, represnts a net balance, in as much as no appreciable expenditure has been incurred by Konati Naik, subsequent to the usual expensive domestic occurrences, which, in his case, include the marriages of his two sons and the death of his wife all taking place prior to the above period.

Konati Naik has at the same time and in the same connection, stated that he had no liabilities, so that the property in question remains uninvolved, the previous

encumbrance resting on it to the extent of Rs.2,000/- being then there removed through the disposal of lands for a sum of Rs.4582/- in the year 1914.

4. That Konati Naik should be made to allow a reasonable sum for our livelihood being so well circumstanced for no purpose, it goes without saying, other than the support of the whole family including myself as the senior-daughter-in-law, but still, being a female member, only entitled to nothing beyond sufficient maintenance according to the Hindu Law.

5. That my husband has stated in his statement before the Civil Court that he is allowed Rs.15/- monthly by his father as pocket-money, This is only a private arrangement between the two and not a actual share of my husband's pension, so that the remaining sum of Rs.72-8-9 becomes available for my father-in-law Konati Naik's family, at present consisting of himself and a little daughter, both living with his eldest son Rajagopal Naik.

6. A similar case of one Kesavamma, of Gudikota Palegar family occurred in May 1884 when she complained about her maintenance to Government. Thereupon instructions were issued to Khazana Bukshi requiring him to call upon Pampapati Raju, the recipient of the family pension, to settle the claim of Kesavamma reasonably (vide Government proceedings dated 19th May 1884). Kesavamma subsequently succeeded in getting a share of Rs.25/- per mensem out of the above family pension amounting to Rs.93-3-4.

7. That having, by birth, attached to a Gosha Family, subsequently married to, and legally divorced from a wicked husband and finally having the sole charge of a daughter coming up to marriageable age, are, as you are not unaware of, insurmountable obstacles to independent living, and

where keeping up one's social position is concerned the situation is better than imagined expressed.

8. That in conclusion, might I once more urge on your prerogative the absolute necessity for securing us, i.e. myself and my daughter, such pecuniary help as the case is considered deserving of, under all its material amd moral aspects already represented for the consideration and orders of Government.

For this act of generosity I shall feel ever grateful, and thanking you in anticipation.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient and humble servant,

25-4-April-1925. ಅಮ್ಮನೆಯಮ್ಮ

Bangalore. (Signed) Ammaneyamma.

Address:-

Kind care of
M.Gopalakrishnaswamy Naik,
Palegar No.147,
Cotton Pettah,
Bangalore City.

Extract from the statement of Konati Naik made before the District Judge of Madura on the 16th day of November 1916.

O. P. No.330 of 1916.

X X X X

He owes about Rs.30,000/- and owes us Rs.14,000/-. I get Rs.87/- monthly pension from Mysore and have Rs. 20,000/- of immovable property in Mysore and Bellary.

X X X X

I have no debt.

X X X X

Sd. R. P. Konetti Naicker

in Telegu.

Sd. F. A. Cleridge,

District Judge.

16-11-16.

(TRUE COPY)

Sd. D.Venkatarama Iyer,

Superintendent.

12-12-1916.

" True Extract".

Copy Compared with the original copy given by the Court and returned to him. Ramakrishna Swami vakil.

8-11-25 28/5/25

25-4-April-1925 Bangalore

App.F.VI-G1.]

SUBJECT

Section SHA
File No. 27/24.
Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to 3995
11045

No. M 6316 / Secto. 1 file

General and Revenue Secretariat
(SHA)
, the 192

To The Comptroller

Sir,

Date of issue 23rd May 1925

Signed by for H.A. Rangacher

With reference to your letter No 7057/SHT of 21.4.25, I am directed to forward herewith petition of 25.4.25 received from Annammiamma of Raidrug Family for favour of further enquiry & report on the allegations made therein.

The enclosures received with your letter under reference are returned for reference & re-transmission.

I have etc.,
Recd 26/5/25
for H. Secretary

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

over

21/5

S&A.27-24-11

50897

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,

No 8309 S.H.Try/Exec: One File

Bangalore, dated 18th June *192*5

D-4992

From

T. SATYARAJ CHETTY, Esq., B.A.,
Comptroller to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
BANGALORE.

To

Rajakaryaprasaktha
Diwan Bahadur M.N. Krishna Rao Esq., B.A.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,.
Financial Department,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.Fl.6316/S&A 27-24-11 dated the 23rd May 1925 forwarding the petition of Ammanniamma for further enquiry and report, I have the honour to report as follows:-

The parties were examined by the State Huzur Treasury Officer on the 28th May 1925. On behalf of his daughter Ammanniamma, the Petitioner, Mr. Gopalkrishnaswami Naik appeared. Mr. R.P. Koneti Naik, father-in-law of the Petitioner, and Mr.R.P. Venkatapathi Naik, husband of the petitioner, appeared in person.

Ammanniamma in her petition to the Financial Secretary alleges that Mr. Koneti Naik is in possession of assets comprising movable and immovable properties valued at Rs 34,000/- and that he is in well-to-do circumstances. Mr. Gopalakrishnaswami Naik in his statement given before the State Huzur Treasury Officer makes the same allegation. He is however not in a position to give any details as to where the movable and immovable properties are at present. He cannot say in which Taluk the immovable properties are situated nor can he give the acreage of the lands supposed to be held by Mr. Koneti Naik. The truth is that Mr. Gopalakrishnaswami Naik believes merely as a matter of inference from a statement made by Mr. Koneti Naik before the District Judge of Madura on 16th November 1916, that he must have

Treasury Officer are herewith forwarded.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller.

CV

G.R.S. VI G 34]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....4992.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

(S.& A.)

, *the* . *192* ..

Date of issue.... 29-8-28

Signed by.....

May this be

i Printed ?

ii treated as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette, English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette, Kannada Part ?

Section S.& A.

File No. 27/24

Serial No. 13

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Read—

Correspondence ending with letter No. 8309/S.H.T. dated 18th June 1925 from the Comptroller submitting the report of enquiry on the petition of Ammanniamma wife of Mr. R.P.Venkatapathi Naik, son of Mr. R.P.Koneti Naik of the Royadrug Pallegar Family praying for the grant of a maintenance allowance of Rs 25/- per mensem for the support of herself and her daughter out of the family pension of Rs 87-8-9 drawn by her father-in-law, Mr. R.P. Koneti Naik as she is living separately from her husband.

Order Thereon No.

ORDER H 1328 dated 29.8.28

On a consideration of all the facts of the case including the

the circumstances which account for the separation of the Petitioner from her husband, Government are convinced that a maintenance allowance is due to her out of the pension intended for the benefit of the family. ~~The~~ of the family pension of Rs. 84-8-9; sum of Rs 20/- will be treated as the share of Mr. R.P.Venkatapathi Naik and out of this share, Rs 15 will be paid to the Petitioner. This order will be given effect to from 1st September 1925.

The ~~Head Sub Bakshi~~ Officiating Shanbhag will see that this amount is ~~distributed~~ disbursed to Ammanniamma regularly every month by the Sarawardar.

Financial Secretary

List of enclosures.

To The Comptroller returning the records.

Copy to Petitioner Ammanniamma.

Copied by

Examined by

WD 1883—GPB—1,000,00—21-12-21